Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Sir or Madam:

These comments are filed in the name of the 24 cities (listed below) that this law firm represents in the capacity as City Attorney, in support of the comments filed by the Alliance of Local Organizations Against Preemption (the "Alliance"). Like the Alliance, the cities that this firm represents believes that (a) local communities should be able to require cable operators to obtain additional authorizations to use and occupy public rights of way to provide cable services, and to enforce existing authorizations that have been granted for the service; (b) should be able to obtain fair and reasonable compensation for use and occupancy of the public rights of way to provide non-cable services; and (c) should be able to regulate cable companies in their provision of non-cable services, as provided under the Cable Act.

These comments will also provide information regarding the status of cable modem service in our community.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Gregory D. Humbach Assistant City Attorney

GDH:mb

## **Texas Cities Represented by Barney Knight & Associates**

- Leander, Texas
  Evant, Texas
  Trinidad, Texas
- 3. Trinidad, Texas4. Kyle, Texas
- 5. Lago Vista, Texas
- 6. Rogers, Texas
- 7. Spearman, Texas
- 8. Kempner, Texas
- 9. Burnet, Texas
- 10. Cottonwood Shores, Texas
- 11. Hays, Texas
- 12. De Leon, Texas
- 13. Village of Bear Creek, Texas

- 14. Woodcreek, Texas
- 15. Dublin, Texas
- 16. Ranger, Texas
- 17. Holland, Texas
- 18. Jonestown, Texas
- 19. Bertram, Texas
- 20. Sunrise Beach, Texas
- 21. Santa Anna, Texas
- 22. Manor, Texas
- 23. Lexington, Texas
- 24. Carmine, Texas